



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble, every man's work shall be made manifest; for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire." Let us now see what account Cardinal Bellarmine gives of this passage, and of the interpretations proposed by the Fathers.

"Thereare," saith he, "five difficulties in this passage.<sup>5</sup> Firstly, What is to be understood by the builders? Secondly, What is to be understood by the gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble? Thirdly, What is to be understood by the day of the Lord? Fourthly, What is to be understood by the fire, concerning which it is said, that in the day of the Lord it will try each man's work? Fifthly, What is to be understood by the fire, concerning which it is said, 'He himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.' If these points are explained, the meaning of the text will be clear."

We beg leave, in passing, to express our entire concurrence in the last remark of the learned Cardinal. Your "if," according to the old proverb, is a great peacemaker. Let us now proceed with the explanation.

"The first difficulty, then," says Bellarmine, "consists in this—who are the builders or architects? 1. Augustine thinks that all Christians are here called architects by the Apostle, and that all build upon the foundation of faith works either good or bad. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, and Eusebius appear to me to give the same interpretation of this verse. Many other Fathers teach that none are called architects by the Apostles except the doctors and preachers of the Gospel. Jerome insinuates the same opinion in the second book of his work against Jovinian; Anselm and Thomas Aquinas adopt the same opinion, without rejecting the former one. Many of the more recent writers follow the same course, as Dionysius Carthusianus, Lyranus, Cajetan, and others.

"The next difficulty is of a more serious kind; for there are here six opinions. Some understand by the word foundation, true but unformed faith; by the gold, silver, precious stones, they understand good works; by the wood, hay, stubble, they understand mortal sins. This is the opinion of Chrysostom on this passage, whom Theophylact follows. The second opinion is, that by the foundation is meant Christ, or the preaching of the Gospel; by the gold, silver, and precious stones are meant heretical doctrines. This appears to be the meaning of the commentary of Ambrose, and also Jerome's. The third class of opinions is, that by the foundation is meant a lively faith; and that by the gold, silver, and precious stones are meant Catholic explanations; and that by the wood, hay, and stubble are meant works of supererogation. This is the opinion of St. Augustine."

We pause here for a moment to direct the attention of our readers to the foregoing illustration of the *unanimity* of the Fathers. The very same phrase of St. Paul's is explained by some Fathers to mean *heretical dogmas*, and by another, *Catholic explanations* of the truth. This is clearly no trifling difference of opinion; and what is the parish priest to do, who has sworn that he will never interpret Scripture except with the unanimous consent of the Fathers? But let us proceed with Bellarmine's statement.

"The fourth opinion is of those who understand by the gold, silver, &c., good works, and by the wood, hay, &c., venial sins. This was the opinion of Pope Gregory the Great<sup>6</sup> and others. The fifth opinion is of those who understand by the gold, silver, &c., good hearers of the Gospel, and by the stubble, bad hearers. So Theodoret and Eusebius, who is well refuted by Chrysostom. The sixth opinion, *which we prefer to all the rest*, is, that by the foundation is to be understood Christ, as he was proclaimed by the first teachers of the Gospel. By the gold, &c., is meant the useful doctrine of other preachers who teach those persons who have already received the faith. By the wood, hay, &c., is to be understood the curious or strange doctrine (not necessarily heretical or bad) of those preachers who preach to Catholic people in a Catholic spirit,<sup>7</sup> but without that advantage and usefulness which God requires."

Upon this last statement of Bellarmine's we will only make the remark, that we fear many of the sermons preached to our Roman Catholic friends, however "Catholic" in spirit, come under the Cardinal's censure of being neither advantageous nor useful; and, further, that although Protestant ministers have never bound themselves, as Bellarmine did, to follow the unanimous consent of the Fathers, they would, nevertheless, agree with him in thinking that our Lord Jesus Christ is the only true foundation of a sinner's hope, according to the statement of the Apostle in the eleventh verse of the chapter—"For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus

Christ." To proceed, however, with the Cardinal's explanation:—

"The third difficulty is concerning the day of the Lord. Some understand by the word day the present life, or the time of tribulation. So Augustine,<sup>8</sup> and Pope Gregory the Great.<sup>9</sup> All the ancients, however, appear to have understood by that day the day of the last judgment, as Theodoret, Theophylact, Anselm, and others. The fourth difficulty is, what is the fire which will try each man's work in the day of the Lord. Some understand the tribulations of this life, as Augustine and Gregory, in the places referred to; but this opinion we have already rejected. Some understand eternal fire; but this cannot be true, for that fire will not try the building of gold and silver. . . . Some understand by this fire the pains of purgatory; but this cannot be the true explanation.<sup>10</sup> Firstly, because the fire of which we are speaking is to try every man's work, of what sort it is; but the fire of purgatory does not try the works of those who build gold and silver. Secondly, the Apostle clearly distinguishes between the work and the workmen, and says of the fire, that it will burn the works, not the workmen; for he says, 'if any man's work shall be burned'; but the fire of purgatory, which is a true and real fire, cannot burn the works, which are transient actions, and have already passed away. Finally, it would follow that even the most holy men pass through the fire; for all must pass through this fire of which we are speaking. But it is manifestly false that all pass through the fire of purgatory, and are saved by fire; for the Apostle here clearly says that it is only those who build wood and hay, that are to be saved as by fire. And, moreover, the Church has always been of opinion that the holy martyrs and infants dying after baptism are at once received into heaven without ever passing through the fire. It remains, therefore, that we must say that the Apostle here speaks of the fire of the severe and just judgment of God, which is not a purgative or punishing fire, but one which tries and examines. So Ambrose explains the passage in his work on the Psalms, and Sedulius agrees with him.

"The fifth and last difficulty is, what is meant by the fire, when the Apostle says, 'he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.' Some understand the tribulations of this life; but this cannot be consistently maintained; for then, even the man who built gold and silver would be saved as if by fire. Wherefore, Augustine and Gregory, who are the authors of this opinion, did not themselves find it satisfactory, and advanced another, about which we will speak hereafter.

"Other Fathers think that the fire here spoken of means eternal fire, as Chrysostom and Theophylact; but this opinion we have already refuted.

"It is, therefore, the common opinion of divines, that by the word fire, in this passage, is to be understood some purgatorial and temporal punishment, to which men are adjudged after death, who, in the particular judgment, are found to have built wood, hay, and stubble."

We feel that some apology is due to our readers for the great length of the foregoing extract; but we considered that the only way of enabling them clearly to understand what is meant by the favourite phrase, "the unanimous consent of the Fathers" was to adduce, from the highest Roman Catholic source, the actual sentiments of the Fathers upon an important passage of Scripture, expressed almost in their own words. For our own parts, if we may venture to express our humble opinion upon the subject at issue, we think that Bellarmine argues much more clearly when he states what is *not* than when he states what is the meaning of the Apostle's words. We commend to our readers' special attention the argument by which the learned Cardinal proves that, whatever may be meant by the fire, in the 13th verse, it *cannot* mean the fire of purgatory, and then request them to observe the cool manner in which he assures, without any argument at all, that the very same word fire, in the 15th verse, *must mean* the fire of purgatory, as well as his astounding assertion, that this is the common opinion of divines—an assertion which can be so signally refuted from his own pages. Bellarmine, however, is candour itself, compared with Bishop Milner, who, relying, one must suppose, upon the ignorance of his readers, had the courage to ask (in speaking of the Scriptural proof of purgatory derived from 1 Cor. iii. 13), "What other sense can that passage of St. Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians bear, than that which the Holy Fathers affixed to it?"<sup>11</sup> when he must have known right well that even Bellarmine had been forced to acknowledge, two centuries before, that scarcely any two Fathers interpreted the passage in the same sense.

In conclusion, we invite our readers to observe the cool manner in which Bellarmine throws overboard the opinions of eminent Fathers like Augustine and Chrysostom when it suits his purpose to do so. And we trust that the remarks which have been made will enable them to form a juster conception than they have hitherto done of the solidity of the "broad-backed tortoise," the unanimous consent of the Fathers, on which, according to Bishop Milner and others, the unlearned Roman Catholic may, in perfect confidence and trust, rest his faith in the true interpretation of Scripture.

### ASSUMPTION OF THE VIRGIN.—NO. II.

A CORRESPONDENT in our last number has invited us to give some additional information on the subject of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary. On the 15th of August in each year the Church of Rome celebrates a festival in commemoration of the fact (?) that after the death of the Blessed Virgin her body was not mingled with the dust, like that of other mortals, but was, in the presence of all the Apostles, taken up by the angels into heaven. As the Scriptures do not record this wonderful event, it is not unnatural to ask on what uninspired authority the belief in it rests; and we endeavoured in a former number (Sept., 1854, vol. iii., p. 108) to do our best to satisfy this reasonable curiosity. We there showed that for full seven hundred years after the death of the Virgin Mary not a single historian or ecclesiastical writer appears to have ever heard of the story which the Church of Rome now accepts as unquestionable truth, and we gave John Damascene, who flourished in the middle of the eighth century, as the earliest author in whose works the tradition could be found. We do not mean to go over the same ground now, and referring to our former article such of our readers as may like to see the proofs that this story was unknown to the ancient Church, we shall in this article enable them to see how it came at length to be believed, and by what arguments the belief in it was at first defended.

But, perhaps, we had better begin by trying to come to an understanding with our readers what is the proper kind of arguments for proving the truth of any story, miraculous or otherwise. Our belief is that the right way of proving a fact is by testimony of some kind. What we like best is, if we can get hold of a trustworthy eye-witness of the facts asserted: when we can find a person deserving of credit who tells us that he was himself present, and saw the things happen which he tells us of. But when we cannot get this, which is the best kind of evidence, as we are not sitting in a court of justice we are not so particular as to refuse to listen to second hand versions of a story. No doubt a story is apt to gain a little in its carriage, but still if it has only come through few hands, and those tolerably trustworthy, we are ready to hope that the story has not been very much disguised on the way. These are what we should call *good* arguments for our belief in any event, and now we shall tell what we think bad ones.

We should think it not a sufficient proof of a miracle merely to tell us that God *could* do it, unless, indeed, He had said that He *would* do it, or unless some one was able to say that he had seen or heard it take place. If, indeed, after a story has been otherwise well proved men cavil at it because it contains an account of miracles, then, no doubt, it is a good plan to remind them of the omnipotence of God, and of the folly of attempting to set bounds to His power. But if the argument from God's power stands alone, it is too elastic to be worth much. For, as there is nothing in the world which He cannot do, this argument might be applied with equal success to both sides of every question; and if we were bound to believe that God actually has done everything which He could do, there is no tale that can be invented which we might not on these principles be called on to accept as true history.

Neither do we think it sufficient reason for believing in an alleged miracle that the occasion seems one on which it appears to us that God might very fitly interpose. This is well worth taking into consideration, if there be first produced some evidence that He really has so interposed; but in the absence of such evidence we do not think ourselves qualified to make our notions of fitness and propriety the standard of God's conduct. If we had the government of the world there are many occasions when we should be tempted to work a miracle: when, for instance, we see good men suffering under undeserved calamity, and wicked men blaspheming God, and to all appearance nothing the worse for their misdeeds. It was by this kind of argument that a sect of ancient heretics persuaded themselves that our Lord did not really suffer and that He was not really crucified for us. It revolted all their notions of fitness that the Son of God should give up His body to wicked men to abuse it at their pleasure, and so they settled it that God must have worked a miracle, and preserved His Son from death, leaving a phantom form in the power of His enemies. This is just one example out of many that might be given how far men's fancies may lead them astray if, in place of being content humbly to inquire what God *has* done, they choose to make themselves judges of what He *must* and *ought* to have done, and regulate their belief accordingly.

Now, we shall show that it is on this bad kind of argument that the story of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin exclusively rests; that those "no first put it forward did not appeal to testimony of any kind, either in Scripture or tradition, and that they grounded their belief merely on their private speculations that it would be a very proper kind of miracle for God to work. In the appendix to one of the volumes of the Benedictine edition of the works of St. Augustine there is contained a little tract on the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin (see vol. vi., appendix, p. 250). We need not say that it was not written by St. Augustine himself, having in our former article given reasons showing that that Father was ignorant of what, if true, would rank among the most signal miracles of the Gospel dispensation. Accordingly, the Benedictine editors have very properly excluded it from their collection of the genuine writings

<sup>5</sup> Quinque sunt difficultates hujus loci. Prima, quid intelligatur per sedificantes, &c. Bellarm. —Disp. Ingolstadt. Tom. I., c. 4, de Purgatorio.

<sup>6</sup> Lib. de fide et operibus. c. 16.

<sup>7</sup> Lib. iv. Dialogorum. c. 39.

<sup>8</sup> Qui ad Catholicum populum Catholicos condescenduntur, sed absque fructu et utilitate quam Deus requirit.

<sup>9</sup> Lib. de fide et operibus. c. 18.

<sup>10</sup> Lib. IV., Dialog. c. 39.

<sup>11</sup> Alii intelligent de peccatis purgatoriis, sed neque id recte dicit potest.

<sup>12</sup> Milner ut supra, p. 413.

of St. Augustine, and are unable to assign to it any certain author. It is not very honourable to the doctrine of the Assumption that it should find its earliest defender in this anonymous production, which was certainly not written within five hundred years of the event which it treats of. All we can say is, that if any of our Roman Catholic friends can point out to us any writer for those first five hundred years who professes to have received in his Church any tradition on the subject, we shall be happy to print at full length all the authorities with which we may be furnished.

But having, as we think, in this tract, got very near the fountain head of the story, what we are most anxious to see is, what was the authority then alleged for it; and we desire to call attention to the fact that the writer of this tract does not bring forward a single authority, either in Scripture or tradition, and that he publishes the whole as a private speculation of his own. We shall give a summary of his arguments, and our readers may judge what they are worth.

The writer premises, at the outset of his discourse, that we find nothing in the Holy Scriptures concerning what befel the Blessed Virgin after the Crucifixion, the last mention of her being that at the commencement of the Acts of the Apostles, where the sacred historian writes—v. 14—"These all continued with one accord in prayer and supplication, with the women and Mary, the Mother of Jesus, and with the brethren." He says that he premises this because subjects of such information must be handled the more cautiously, because they cannot be clearly established by the special testimonies of authorities. As to any tradition on the subject not recorded in Scripture he is wholly silent. But he says that there are many things which, though not at all recorded, are believed, by arguments founded on reason and the fitness of things. He gives, as an example, the fact that Enoch and Elijah have been in a state of happiness since their removal from this world, which we believe without requiring any special testimony of Scripture to this truth. Let us see, then, what we are to say concerning the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin, where, though the Scriptures are silent, we may inquire what reason teaches us to be agreeable with truth.

"And, first, we need not hesitate to confess that she underwent temporal death, since her Son Himself, though God as well as man, underwent the same, in conformity with the laws of human condition. But if we say that she was held by the bonds of death, and was resolved into dust, and worms, and ashes, let us consider whether such a lot is suitable to so great holiness. The sentence 'Dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return,' was not universal in its application, for it did not pass on our Lord Himself, of whom it was said, 'Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer Thy Holy One to see corruption.' As, then, the flesh which was taken from the Virgin was an exception to the general law, why might not her own flesh be so too?"

Next follows an argument founded on the fact that the Virgin Mary was not included in the curse pronounced on Eve, since she suffered no pains of childbirth in bringing forth our Lord, and on other facts of the same nature, about which Scripture gives us no information. As the premises of these arguments are as uncertain as the conclusion, we need not devote any space to them.

The writer next quotes our Lord's prayer in the 17th John, in order to prove that our Lord was one with His mother—"Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom Thou hast given me, that they may be one, as We are . . . That they all may be one, as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee; that they also may be one in Us . . . Father, I will that those whom Thou hast given Me be with Me where I am." We may remark, in passing, that whatever these verses prove they prove as much for all our Lord's people as for the Blessed Virgin. But the writer justly concludes from them that the soul of Mary, now in glory, possesses that body of our Lord which she brought forth; and (he adds) why not also that body which brought it forth?

Well, why not? If there be no authority against it which he has not yet examined, he sees no reason to the contrary, and concludes that so precious a treasure would be much fitter placed in heaven than consigned on earth to worms and corruption.

He adds another argument founded on the verse of St. John c. xii., v. 26—"Where I am, there shall also My servant be." And as it cannot be denied that the Blessed Virgin faithfully served our Lord on earth, he concludes that she is with Him now. The argument is good enough as far as her soul is concerned; but if it can be urged with reference to her body it would prove equally that the bodies of all God's other faithful servants are now with Him in heaven; and, in this case, it need not be a heresy now, as it was in the Apostles' days, to say that the resurrection is past already.

The writer then falls back on his great argument that God could do it. He preserved the body of Jonah in the whale's belly; He preserved the bodies of the three children in the fiery furnace. Who shall say that He could not also preserve the body of Mary and exalt it to heaven.

And, in fine, the writer concludes with a prayer that as we now know in part and prophesy in part, God may pardon whatever errors or imperfections there may be in his treatise. If he has said truth he thanks Christ who has

enabled him to speak worthily of Him; but if not, he prays that the Lord may forgive him.

The abstract we have given proves decisively that the story of the Assumption cannot in any way be reckoned as history; that for five centuries after the death of the Virgin the Church was not in possession of the slightest tradition on the subject; and that when people first began to speculate on the subject they did not appeal to testimony of any kind, but only to such arguments from reason as they were themselves able to invent.

We need not say that we think the arguments of which we have given a specimen very bad ones. The proof which would have put the matter out of controversy would be if God had said in His written word that He had exalted the body of the Virgin to Heaven, or if He had anywhere promised to do so. And the next best proof would be the testimony of any persons who had seen this miracle performed or who had heard of it from others who had seen it. But when it is not pretended that any one ever professed to have witnessed it, and for whole centuries no one ever heard of the story, we cannot pay much attention to any one who comes forward only now with his private speculation that this was a miracle which it would have been very fitting for God to work. If this kind of argument were worth much it would be a very easy matter to write history. We should only have to settle in our minds how we should like things to turn out, and then write away that this was how they actually happened. If Roman Catholics write the facts of the Sacred History in this random way, according to their own notions of fitness and propriety, and without any evidence of testimony to back them, how can they wonder if Protestants do not attach much credit to some of their later stories. For example, how can we be expected to believe in the miracles of St. Francis Xavier or of any other of their missionary saints, when, for all we know, their history may have been written in the same way. It was very desirable and agreeable to our notion of fitness that God should assist a missionary to the heathen, by enabling him to work miracles; therefore we may take for granted that He has done so, and, without inquiring for testimony, we may set down that things occurred just as we would like them to have occurred, and we may set down that God has worked whatever miracles we should have worked if the government of the world had been in our hands.

If the lives of the saints are written in this fashion can Roman Catholics themselves believe them? But if our Roman Catholic readers do not think this a good way of writing the life of a saint, can they think it a good or a reverend way to write the history of the Blessed Virgin?

#### ANCIENT FORMS OF ORDINATION.

HAVING given our readers some information respecting ancient liturgies, and also respecting ancient forms of absolution, we think it will be suitable to the objects for which this paper was established to add some information now about ancient forms of ordination.

All are agreed that Christ established a Church for ever, and in that Church a ministry which was to continue always.

We undertake to show the grievous errors in faith of the Church of Rome, and the falsehood of her pretensions and promises. We undertake also to show to Christians in our own country a purer and more Scriptural Church.

But writers of the Church of Rome reply, that the Church which we call purer does not possess the ministry which Christ established in His Church.

That ministry was established by Christ that men might learn to believe and obey Him. It would be better to believe and obey Christ without a ministry, than to deny and disobey Him with a ministry. If we were driven to such a choice, as some have been, we would choose the end without the ordinary means, rather than the means without the end. We should consider this our duty to Christ as members of His Church; and we would trust Him to give the gifts and operations of His Spirit without the ordinary means He has appointed, just as in the first age of the Church He sent the Holy Ghost upon Cornelius and his company, without their being baptized (Acts x.), as it were to teach His Church this lesson—that He will never fail His Church, although His ministers fail.

But we are not driven to this alternative in our contest with the Church of Rome. We are able to show that the pure Church in these countries has also the ministry which Christ established in His Church, and that the denial of our ministry has no foundation but the ignorance of our accusers respecting the forms of ordination used in the ancient Church.

It is necessary to observe that, according to the doctrine of the Church of Rome, the question of the validity or invalidity of orders in a Church separated from Rome is not dependent on the question of the schism or heresy of the Church so separated. The Church of Rome acknowledges that the orders of the Greek Church, which she calls schismatical, are valid. The Church of Rome acknowledges that the orders of the Nestorians, Jacobites, and other Eastern Churches, which she calls heretical, are valid. The Church of Rome acknowledges that orders continue valid in a Church separated from Rome

by schism or by heresy provided the succession of bishops, and a valid form of ordination, are preserved.

Therefore, by the confession of the Church of Rome herself, the charge which she makes against us of heresy and schism does not invalidate our orders, even if that charge were true; and to prove that we have no orders, it must be shown either that we have no succession of bishops, or that the form of ordaining which we use is incapable of conferring orders.

We have formerly put forward a fair challenge as to the succession of our bishops. None of our able and acute Roman Catholic correspondents have ever ventured to say one word in reply; therefore, we have not at present to defend our orders on the ground of succession.

The other objection is, that our form of ordination is in itself incapable of conveying orders. This is the objection we are now about to deal with.

The service for the ordination of priests in the Church of England and Ireland ordains by the laying on of hands and by prayer.

Our opponents assert that some other form, which we omit, is essentially necessary to confer the order of a priest.

The supposed essential requisite for ordaining a priest which we shall chiefly have to discuss is thus stated in the Catechism of the Council of Trent:—"The bishop, handing to the candidate for priest's orders a chalice which contains wine and water, and a patena with bread, says—'Receive the power of offering sacrifice,' &c., words which, according to the uniform interpretation of the Church, impart power, when the proper matter is supplied, of consecrating the holy Eucharist, and impress a character on the soul."<sup>a</sup> And again—"He next anoints his hands with sacred oil, reaches him a chalice containing wine, and a patena with bread, saying, 'Receive power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate Mass as well for the living as for the dead.' By THESE WORDS AND CEREMONIES he is constituted an interpreter and mediator between God and man, the principal function of the priesthood."<sup>b</sup>

Thus the delivery of the bread and wine is the "matter" of the sacrament of orders; and the words, "Receive power to offer sacrifice," &c., is the "form" of the sacrament of orders in the Church of Rome. Without "matter and form" there is no sacrament; and, therefore, it is commonly held in the Church of Rome that any form of ordaining a priest which does not use this matter and this form is not valid, and does not confer the order of a priest; and since the Church of England and Ireland does not use this "matter and form," she has no valid orders. This is the argument of our opponents.

We propose to settle the question by an appeal to the forms of ordination used in the ancient Church. We find that all the ancient forms of ordination ordained simply by laying on of hands and by prayer; and never by the delivery of the cup and the bread.

From this we conclude; First—That the form used in the Church of England and Ireland is valid. Second—That if the modern ceremonies used in the Church of Rome are essential to the validity of ordination, then there never was a priest with valid ordination in the Church of Christ for a thousand years.

In tracing the essentials of the ordination of a priest, we take our materials from the work of John Morinus,<sup>c</sup> "a priest of the Congregation of the Oratory" in the Church of Rome; and we gladly say that he is a learned and a candid author.

It is interesting to observe how Morinus was led into this line of study. He relates it in his preface to the Latin forms of ordination (p. 209).

He first read the modern Greek forms of ordination, and compared them with the modern Latin forms, and found a great difference between them, especially when he took into account the axioms or maxims of the schoolmen. He saw that it necessarily followed from these maxims that the orientals had no priesthood at all, since none of those things which those great and famous schoolmen consider of the substance of ordination were observed by the Greeks and other orientals. But this seemed to him absurd and horrible, and, moreover, contrary to the mind of the Roman Church and its daily practice.<sup>d</sup> But Morinus says that this appeared to him much more absurd when he saw with his own eyes that the most ancient Greek forms of ordination were as different from the modern Latin forms as the modern Greek forms themselves; and, therefore, according to the maxims of the schoolmen (those great and famous doctors of the Church of Rome) all those Greek Fathers who chiefly composed the General Councils were as much without orders as the modern Greeks themselves. But this was not all. On referring to the ancient forms of

<sup>a</sup> Catechism of the Council of Trent, translated by the Rev. J. Donovan, professor, &c., Maynooth, p. 309. Ed. Dublin, 1823.

<sup>b</sup> P. 318.

<sup>c</sup> We use the word "Priest" throughout this article in its proper sense. The Greek Old Testament, which the apostles used, called Aaron and his sons, who offered the sacrifices of the law of Moses, *prieatōn*. The writers of the New Testament would not use that word for Christ's ambassadors, but called them *prieatōn*. The word "Priest" is merely a contraction of the Greek word *prieatōn*, or, "Presbyter," and is the proper English of that word.

<sup>d</sup> The title of the work is "Commentarius de Sacris Ecclesie ritibus nationibus, &c." Ed. Antwerp, 1-85.

<sup>e</sup> Morinus has shown in the first part of his work that the Church of Rome admits the validity of the Greek ordinations.